

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

6.6 PREPARATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT	
PLAN (HPMP) (CUL 6) .....	CUL 6-1
6.6.1 Study Objectives .....	CUL 6-1
6.6.2 Study Area .....	CUL 6-1
6.6.3 Methods .....	CUL 6-1
6.6.4 Key Questions .....	CUL 6-1
6.6.5 Results .....	CUL 6-2
6.6.6 Discussion .....	CUL 6-2
6.6.7 Schedule .....	CUL 6-3
6.6.8 References .....	CUL 6-3

## LIST OF TABLES

NONE

## LIST OF FIGURES

NONE

This page intentionally blank.

## **6.6 PREPARATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN (HPMP) (CUL 6)**

### 6.6.1 Study Objectives

The objective of the Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) is to provide a framework for the management of National Register-eligible cultural resources in the study area. The HPMP should not only create a clear set of procedures for management, but it should also unify disparate research projects into a whole that can address substantive research questions.

### 6.6.2 Study Area

The primary archaeological and the historic structures APEs essentially follow the Project boundaries. The secondary archaeological APE includes the Merwin Wildlife Habitat Management Program lands. The primary TCP APE extends along the North Fork of the Lewis River from its mouth to its headwaters, including its tributaries and land within 1-mile of the river channel. The secondary TCP study area is bordered by the Columbia River to the south and west, by the Cowlitz River to the north, and by Mt. Adams to the east (HRA 2004; PacifiCorp 1999). The APEs are delineated on maps included in the Study Plan Document (PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD 1999, as amended).

### 6.6.3 Methods

The Applicants will develop measures for the mitigation of impacts on National Register eligible cultural resources through avoidance, protection, and data recovery. These measures will be associated with potential impacts in the APE and will be evaluated as part of the PDEA. The HPMP will summarize the inventory and evaluation of the projects' cultural resources; discuss project impacts; and include measures to address erosion, relic collecting, and ORV driving in the APE. The plan will address the curation of collections and data, the long-term monitoring of endangered cultural resources, and a protocol for the discovery of previously unrecorded archaeological sites. The preliminary mitigation and management measures will be the subject of consultation with the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, Yakama Nation, USFS, and the OAHP.

### 6.6.4 Key Questions

Results of the HRMP can be used to address the some of the following “key” watershed questions identified during the Lewis River Cooperative Watershed Studies meetings:

- Where are the areas that need protection?

The archaeological inventory indicated that the reservoir drawdown and shoreline areas contain sites that need protection. The historical structures inventory identified historic districts around Merwin Dam and for the Swift No. 1 project as well as the Speelyai fish hatchery, where structures need protective management. The work identified no specific areas of TCPs, although the CIT and YN will review planned

project development activities to identify conflicts and recommend avoidance or mitigation measures.

- What evidence is available for the existence of previously undocumented and/or unknown sites?

Site investigations revealed previously undocumented archaeological sites and historical buildings/structures that had not been previously recorded. The CIT and YN determined that they would not reveal confidential information on TCPs but would review plans for specific project development activities to identify conflicts with TCPs and recommend measures for avoidance or mitigation.

- What are the conditions of known or newly identified sites of cultural, historical, or archaeological importance?

The archaeological sites are in varied condition, having been affected by reservoir erosion, unauthorized artifact collection, and some ORV driving. The historical buildings and structures are generally in good condition.

- Do sites identified in the reservoir areas meet the significance criteria for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places?

A number of archaeological sites and historical buildings/structures meet the criteria for National Register listing. The CIT and YN will provide information to the Applicants on which archaeological sites the tribes believe are eligible for listing in the National Register based on heritage value.

- Are there 19th or 20th century sites of historical significance that need protection?

One early 20th century archaeological site needs protection, and the National Register-eligible Merwin and Swift No. 1 historic districts need protective management.

### 6.6.5 Results

The results of the cultural resources studies, the natural resource studies, and the formulation of project alternatives provided information for the HPMP. Previous work on the Yale Project supported an analysis of management measures for that project's National Register eligible archaeological sites. PacifiCorp prepared a draft set of measures, consisting of methods and schedules to monitor erosion and relic collecting, and provided it to the Lewis River Cultural Resource Group for review and discussion. Following review and comments, PacifiCorp revised the HPMP.

### 6.6.6 Discussion

The archaeological inventory survey and test excavations revealed prehistoric and historic-period sites that had not been previously recorded. Several sites are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places based on their archaeological information, and one cemetery site dates to the late 19th/early 20th century. The Indian

tribes stated that the prehistoric archaeological sites hold traditional heritage value for them, and these sites will be treated as National Register-eligible until Project effects make it necessary to provide formal determinations of eligibility.

The inventory of historical buildings and structures resulted in the identification of National Register-eligible historic districts near Merwin Dam and for the Swift No. 1 project, as well as the Speelyai Hatchery. These resources date to the 20th century. One early 20th century archaeological site needs protection, and the National Register-eligible Merwin and Swift No. 1 historic districts need protective management.

The archaeological sites are in varied condition, having been affected by reservoir erosion, unauthorized artifact collection, and some ORV driving. Most sites occur in reservoir drawdown and shorelines areas, where they need protection. The historical buildings and structures are generally in good condition, although they would benefit from protective management.

PacifiCorp's HPMP contains a review the methods and results of the inventory and National Register evaluation of archaeological sites, and historical buildings and structures. The plan provides procedures for consulting with the tribes about potential impacts and avoidance or mitigation measures for specific planned development activities. The plan also describes the impacts of project alternatives and sets out measures for avoidance, mitigation, and management of these resources during the period of the new license.

#### 6.6.7 Schedule

This work is complete.

#### 6.6.8 References

Historical Research Associates, Inc. (HRA). 2004. Historic Properties Management Plan for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Relicensing of the Merwin Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 935), Swift No. 1, Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2111), and Swift No. 2 Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2213), Clark, Cowlitz, and Skamania Counties, Washington.

PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD. 1999. Study Plan Document for the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects. Draft. Portland, OR, and Longview, WA. October 29, 1999, as amended in 2001.

This page intentionally blank.